Case 1:07-cv-02799-MGC-FM Document 301 Filed

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
----X
RAMY LAKAH and MICHEL LAKAH,

AUSIDE SONY 1 of 2
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 4//6//-

Petitioners,

ORDER

-against-

07 Civ. 2799 (MGC)

UBS AG, EXPORTERS INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD., ARAB BANKING CORPORATION, NATIONAL BANK OF ABU DHABI, and NATIONAL BANK OF OMAN,

			R	e	S	p	0	n	a	e	n	t	S	•		
																v

## Cedarbaum, J.

Petitioners Ramy and Michel Lakah (hereinafter "Petitioners")
move for reversal of Magistrate Judge Maas's February 11, 2015
rulings on the record. Magistrate Judge Maas's rulings denied three
of the four motions collectively put forth by Petitioners in their
Second Motion in Limine. Petitioners first argue that Magistrate
Judge Maas should have confined his judgment to the issue of whether
to preclude Respondents UBS AG, Exporters Insurance Co., Ltd., Arab
Banking Corp., National Bank of Abu Dhabi, and National Bank of Oman
(hereinafter "Respondents") from calling Mr. Al Bardai as a witness
at trial. However, as shown in the Order of Reference, the entire
Second Motion in Limine was referred to Magistrate Judge Maas for
adjudication. Therefore, Petitioners' claim that Magistrate Judge
Maas exceeded the scope of his authority by ruling on multiple parts
of the motion, is incorrect.

Petitioners' additional arguments in support of their motion to reverse Magistrate Judge Maas's rulings are merely a rehashing of the same arguments presented in the briefing on the motion in limine.

According to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), where there is an objection to a magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive matter, the district judge should modify or set aside the ruling if it is "clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." "Reversal is warranted only if the reviewing court is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed . . . . Consequently, parties seeking to overturn the Magistrate's discovery rulings bear a heavy burden."

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. Schneider 551 F. Supp. 2d 173, 177 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (internal quotation omitted). Petitioners' objections do not provide any reason to find that Magistrate Judge Maas's ruling is either erroneous or contrary to the law.

Therefore, Petitioners' motion for reversal of Magistrate Judge
Maas's decision is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York April 16, 2015

> MIRIAM GOLDMAN CEDARBAUM United States District Judge